

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/999,730

Applicant(s)

Staat

Examiner

S. Joseph Morano

Group Art Unit

3613

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) S. Joseph Morano

(3) _____

(2) Randolf J. Huis

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 12, 1998

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Plastic models of couplers which correspond to missing models in parent application, as well as known prior art on the market and a model of applicant's invention. Applicant left samples of prior art and own invention.

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

Couplers of prior art (physical models).

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner initiated a telephone interview to indicate that the amended claims appeared to define over the references cited in the parent, but that a further search would be necessary in light of the new limitations. Examiner also stated that the examiner remembered a model as being part of the protest papers in the parent application, but that the model appeared to be missing, and the examiner remembered the model as being possibly applicable. Applicant agreed to a personal interview in which the models would be brought for the examiner's consideration. Examiner agreed that none of the prior art models, including the one which corresponded to the missing protest model, appeared to show the specifically claimed shape of the cantilever spring.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.


S. JOSEPH MORANO
PRIMARY EXAMINER